THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY.

Annual Report for 1900.

THE
National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.
Pres. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.
Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Boston.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.
Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.
Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., Newton Centre.
Rev. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, Roxbury.
Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., Chicago.
Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Cambridge.
Rev. WILLIAM H. COBB, D.D., Newton Centre.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1900.

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
74 India Street,
1901.

Notices.

This Report as usual deals only with the chief topics of interest in the last year. Preceding Reports and "The Review of Fifteen Years," in the Report for 1895, will give the reader a survey of the field and work as a whole. Reports for 1890 and later years only are still in print. These can be sent to any who desire them. Stamps for postage are always welcome.

A small tract of fifteen pages on "The Pastor and the Home;" a paper on the origin and principles of "The Home Department of the Sunday School;" a Report to a National Council of Congregational Churches on "The Family;" and a leaflet on "The Aims, Methods, and Results of our Work" can still be supplied freely to all applicants. Few copies are now in print of other and more important papers.

Reports of the Commissions on Uniform Legislation can be obtained from their Secretary, Albert E. Henschel, 214 Broadway, New York.

The Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, can be had on application addressed to the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Attention is invited to the list of generous special donations from many of our regular contributors, found on page 22, toward the extinction of the debt of the League, and also to the vote at the annual meeting, which is recorded in the minutes. It is now hoped that the general public will hasten to send in sums sufficient to provide for the needs of the work. Let the Secretary be thus spared, as far as possible, the diversion of his time and thought from his chief duties.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the Family?* Every one who has profited by the work of the League, or who believes in

its mission, is urgently requested to aid us by a contribution of money.

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

The Twenty-first Annual Meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held at 2.30 P.M., in the room of Professor Huntington, Boston University. In the absence of the President, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., the Vice-President, George Harris, D.D., LL.D., presided. Prayer was offered by Dr. Harris. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. Dr. Daniel Merriman and Mr. William G. Benedict were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year. The report of the Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, was presented and accepted, and referred to Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., as Auditor.

The report of the Executive Committee was given by Dr. George Harris. It was accepted and its recommendations adopted, as follows: —

(1) The salary of the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., be fixed at $1,800 per annum.

(2) Any surplus of receipts over expenditures be applied to the payment of the remaining indebtedness of $479.58.

It was voted that the League ratify the action of the Treasurer in the payment of $1,800 to the Corresponding Secretary for the past year.

The report of the Corresponding Secretary was presented by Dr. Dike, who read portions thereof and made comments upon parts not read. It was accepted and ordered printed and distributed at the discretion of Dr. Dike.

Mr. Herrick presented the following resolution: —

Resolved, That in the death of Hon. Charles C. Burr, during the past year, the National League for the Protection of the Family has lost a valuable and devoted member, and we recall with gratitude his long and faithful service.

It was voted that this resolution be spread upon the records, and a copy sent to the family of Mr. Burr.

The Nominating Committee, through Dr. Merriman, reported the following list of officers: —

President, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., President Seth Low, LL.D., President George Harris, D.D., LL.D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D.

Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict.

Executive Committee, President George Harris, D.D., President M. H. Buckham, D.D., Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Rev. James DeNormandie, Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Rev. William H. Cobb, D.D., Mr. Everett O. Fisk, Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

Voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
Recording Secretary.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 25, 1901.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

We came yesterday, Jan. 24, 1901, to the twentieth anniversary of our society. The past year, notwithstanding the distractions of a presidential campaign, has been one of much interest in our work and its subjects. Efforts at improved legislation are springing up almost spontaneously in various parts of the country. The bill of the State Commissions on Uniform Legislation,— now thirty-five in number,— which we printed last year, has been perfected and is now before many Legislatures for adoption. The ministers and churches of the country are unusually active in their interest in the better protection of the Family, and the study of the Family and Home in educational and other circles goes on increasingly. By the generous special gifts of many old contributors for the purpose, a little over two-thirds of our accumulated debt has been paid. Of these subjects we shall speak more fully on succeeding pages.

INVESTIGATION.

Inquiries for the latest statistics are coming more frequently. Untrustworthy figures constantly appear in the newspapers and mislead the public. As the Government Report, which we secured, brought the statistics of marriage and divorce down to 1887 only, and as only eight or ten States give annual reports on these subjects, this inquiry is natural. The country should know the facts for recent years. Now that the work of the census is out of the way we think it will be easy to secure a supplementary investigation, and steps for the purpose will be taken at the earliest practicable moment.

Meanwhile, citizens all over the country should take measures for the annual collection and publication of statistics of marriage and divorce in their own State. Few, if any, subjects are more deserving of such treatment. The system adopted in Massachusetts and Michigan will serve as a model or guide. A paper of the Corresponding Secretary of the League, read before the International Statistical Institute, on "The Condition and Needs of Statistics of Marriage and Divorce," was reprinted from the Proceedings of the Institute, and will be sent to any one who asks for it. Will not our readers see

that the right parties are interested in the enactment of such a law in their own States as will meet the need?

PUBLICATIONS.

Our publications have always been diligently sought by libraries and students of all classes, and greatly valued. These are now nearly all out of print, and our resources have not been large enough to warrant the reissue of such as are of permanent value and the publication of others. The need here is all the greater because the tendencies and present sharp competition for novelties in periodical literature have restricted our use of reviews, and even of the religious press, in ways hitherto open to us. The creation of a small fund for such an object by some benevolent person would be a great boon to the people. Some of the essays, embodying the results of the studies of university and other students, on various themes connected with the Family, are probably well worth publication and wide distribution. But small leaflets and the like, giving the facts regarding changes in law, proposed legislation, lines of study, and sources of information would be extremely useful.

Two recent books have valuable chapters on the Family, which will interest those who are studying the subject in the Gospels. The first, issued a year or two since, is Professor Shailer Mathews's "Social Teaching of Jesus." The other, just published, is by Professor Francis G. Peabody, entitled "Jesus and the Social Question." A third, written several years ago by Rev. George Matheson, of Scotland, on "The Spiritual Development of St. Paul," has a very suggestive chapter on the development of the Apostle's treatment of the Family. However widely many will dissent from the views of these writers, they afford an opportunity to observe some of the more recent methods of its treatment.

UNIFORM LEGISLATION

We printed in our Report last year a bill proposed by the State Commissions on Uniform Legislation — now thirty-five in number — for public consideration and suggestion. This bill has since been carefully revised by the commissioners and is to be introduced in the Legislatures of the States the present winter, in the hope that a good beginning may be made in its general enactment. The perfected bill is given below, together with the explanations of the commissions in a report which they made to the American Bar Association for its information.

At the request of officials of the commissions our League has given information concerning the bill to the religious and other newspapers,

and in other ways aided their work. Some of our suggestions have been adopted in its provisions. Public opinion is fast becoming unanimous, as the subject is really understood, in the judgment that for the present, at least, all attempts at the amendment of the Constitution of the United States in the interests of uniformity through national legislation are unwise and a hindrance to the solution of the difficult problem. It may not be improbable that a similar change of opinion is going on regarding the proposed Anti-Polygamy amendment. Constitutional amendments have an attraction for many, especially for those who have never really studied the subject, but who are eager for a short cut to some desired end.

THE PROPOSED UNIFORM LAW OF DIVORCE PROCEDURE.

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A LAW UNIFORM WITH THE LAWS OF OTHER STATES RELATIVE TO DIVORCE PROCEDURE AND DIVORCE FROM THE BOND OF MARRIAGE.

SECTION 1. No divorce shall be granted for any cause arising prior to the residence of the complainant or defendant in this State which was not a ground for divorce in the State where the cause arose.

SEC. 2. No person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising in this State who has not had actual residence in this State for at least one year next before bringing suit for divorce, with a *bona fide* intention of making this State his or her permanent home.

SEC. 3. No person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising out of this State unless the complainant or defendant shall have resided within this State for at least two years next before bringing suit for divorce, with a *bona fide* intention of making this State his or her permanent home.

SEC. 4. No person shall be entitled to a divorce unless the defendant shall have been personally served with process, if within this State, or if without this State, shall have had personal notice duly proved and appearing of record, or shall have entered an appearance in the case; but if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court that the complainant does not know the address nor the residence of the defendant and has not been able to ascertain either, after reasonable and due inquiry and search, continued for six months after suit brought, the court or judge in vacation may authorize notice by publication of the pendency of the suit for divorce, to be given in manner provided by law.

SEC. 5. No divorce shall be granted solely upon default nor solely upon admissions by the pleadings, nor except upon hearing before the court in open session.

SEC. 6. After divorce either party may marry again; but in cases where notice has been given by publication only and the defendant has not appeared, no decree or judgment for divorce shall become final or operative until six months after hearing and decision.

SEC. 7. Wherever the word "divorce" occurs in this act it shall be deemed to mean divorce from the bond of marriage.

Sec. 8. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The committee add, "This short, simple, and most moderate act is the outcome of much deliberation and discussion extending over three years' sessions of the Conference. The act proposed attacks directly, and we believe effectively, three of the greatest evils, considered from a legal standpoint, of the present condition of our various and conflicting divorce laws. First, it does away largely with the scandal of migratory divorces. Second, it prevents the wrong of speedy decrees against absent defendants who may be ignorant of any suit pending. Third, it does away with the interstate confusion arising from some few States forbidding remarriage, while a great majority of the States permit it.

"The first section will prevent a change of residence being made in order to procure a divorce for a cause that is not a ground for divorce in the State where the cause arose, but is a ground in the State to which the party moves. This measure will prevent each State from having its own citizens defying its laws by simply going temporarily to another State, obtaining a divorce there that could not be obtained in the home State, and then returning to the home State after having successfully evaded its law. Migratory divorces will thus be largely stopped, and each State will preserve its authority over the marital status of its own citizens."

The next three sections on residence and service hardly need explanation to a body of lawyers. It is well known that a fertile source of wrong-doing in divorce is afforded where divorce can be obtained without the knowledge of the other party. Theoretically, no divorce should ever be granted until the court has adequate proof that the other party has had notice of the pendency of the complaint.

"The object of the first part of Section 4 is to secure this notice and proof of it for the court. In practice, however, provision must be made for those cases where the opposite party cannot be found. Not to provide for such a contingency would simply be to place a premium upon concealment — the party desirous of preventing divorce would simply go into hiding and then no divorce could be obtained, no matter how valid the reasons for granting it." It seems to us that all reasonable means have been taken in this section to guard against fraud. A perusal of the proposed bill will show that with the six months' notice required after suit brought and the six months required before the decree of judgment becomes operative, at least a year must elapse before the divorce becomes final, in cases where the defendant is not personally served.

As to remarriage, we believe the views of Mr. Nelson in his recent work on "Divorce and Separation," vol. 2, page 566, are almost universally shared by the profession: —

"The evident intent of these statutes is to prevent the guilty party from entering into another marriage. He having been unfaithful to the obligations of the first marriage, it is presumed that he is unfit to enter into a second marriage unless he reforms. But such prohibition is in fact a restraint of marriage. It leaves at large a person who by false representations may in-

duce an unsuspecting woman to enter into a void marriage; or if this does not occur, the unfortunate defendant who cannot marry is tempted to continue adulteries without incentive to reformation. A prohibition which restrains marriage, encourages adultery, leaves the party in a position to contract void marriages, and takes away a natural incentive to reformation should be held contrary to public policy. These considerations are sufficient to justify the repeal of such statutes."

If it is objected that this law would render the time necessary to acquire jurisdiction shorter in some few States, it is to be remembered that, different from most uniform laws, which require to be absolutely identical wherever adopted, the evident object of the bill and the result desired to be obtained would not render it necessary, in carrying out the intent of the act, to have that part of it relating to the time of residence identical or the present time of residence lowered, in any instance. As any one State can defeat, in some respects, the purposes of this Act, by not passing it, as much as though twenty allowed speedy divorces without the safeguards prescribed in this Act, it seemed to the Conference not wise to put the time limit of residence beyond that of the average of all the States.

Although this bill is simply a bill of procedure, it really goes to the substance of the whole matter. Not only has the law of procedure, or the adjective law, always had a profound influence upon the substantive law, but it really becomes a part of the substantive law in this instance.

The Conference has had under consideration a bill relating to the causes for divorce, but has not deemed it advisable to recommend it for passage at this time; first, because of the great divergence of opinion in regard to the nature of the marriage contract and what are just causes of divorce, and secondly, because such a bill presented at this time with the Procedure Act might tend to prevent any improvement in legislation on this important subject.

As a League we may congratulate ourselves upon the present outlook for Uniformity. From the first we avoided committal to the policy of constitutional amendment as difficult of attainment and of doubtful value, and something to be tried only as a last resort. For the sake of the necessary facts we obtained the Government Report on Marriage and Divorce. We brought the Committee on Uniformity of the American Bar Association, which had then accomplished little or nothing, into communication with the first commission created by a State Legislature on a plan suggested by our own first President, Dr. Woolsey, of Yale University, and which Governor Robinson recommended to the Legislature of Massachusetts in 1884, and we have since aided the project in every way open to us, but without committing ourselves to any specific measure. The plan now being tried is, of course, an experiment; but it is one of much promise, while it leaves the way open for the other course, if we find it necessary to take that.

STATE LEGISLATION.

Louisiana has prohibited marriage between first cousins. Virginia requires the clerk issuing marriage licenses to ascertain if either of the parties are divorced persons. New Jersey permits oath to be administered in inquiries for facts in cases of marriage license, and this fact is noted on certificate of marriage. Ohio makes it a felony for a parent to refuse to support a child who is an inmate of a county home.

A strong movement was made in Rhode Island, whose divorces have reached about four hundred annually, to improve the divorce laws, and it nearly succeeded. It is to be renewed this winter. There are also steps being taken towards the same end in Maine, New York, South Dakota, Missouri, and California, besides the general movement to adopt the Uniform Procedure Bill of the Commissions. This being the year for most Legislatures to be in session, we may expect to report considerable progress at its close.

We began a study of the legislation of the last ten or fifteen years, hoping to give a summary, but have been unable to finish the work. Our former Annual Reports show that the movement of legislation is almost invariably in the direction of reform in both marriage and divorce laws. Some States, like Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Wisconsin, have introduced good systems of marriage license law. In others defects have been remedied. California, Georgia, the Dakotas, and all the Territories have raised their term of residence before divorce, and some of these States are at work to meet other points of weakness. Delaware led in the principle of comity now appearing in the first section of the proposed Uniform Law of Procedure. These efforts will be much strengthened by the Bill for Uniformity now coming before the Legislatures.

We probably can report another winter on the working of the new imperial law for Germany, of whose peculiar and interesting features we gave some account in our last Report.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH.

This subject has received more attention than ever the past year. Ministers of the Gospel are carefully considering their duty in respect to the celebration of the marriage of divorced persons, and of others whose marriage is of doubtful propriety. The correspondence of the League and the action of various associations of ministers and of large church bodies show this.

The drift of thought seems to be towards the need of some approach to uniformity of action, based either on a commonly received interpre-

tation of the sacred Scriptures or on some principle of Christian comity. In short, the feeling is growing that the mischiefs of our conflicting State laws are matched by similar evils within the Church itself. If the Church is saying less than formerly about the condition of civil law, it is largely because it is more awake to its own defects. It is well that the problem of State and Church is coming to be recognized as a common one.

In some places ministers of different faiths have formally agreed not to marry divorced persons except in case of the innocent party in a divorce for adultery; but more frequently the attempt to secure this has resulted in failure to agree upon anything. In our former Reports, and elsewhere, the suggestion has been made that the more feasible steps be taken first. Among these are the refusal to marry strangers without proper introduction by responsible persons; the refusal, on the principle of interdenominational comity, to marry persons who are under the pastoral care of other Christian communions who could not be married by the rules or principles of their own church; and the exercise of the greatest care to be faithful to the rules or teaching of one's own recognized ecclesiastical authorities.

Conscientious ministers sometimes complain that town clerks, and others whose duty it is to secure, under oath, the required facts regarding those who apply for marriage licenses, do not always furnish trustworthy documents, due often to the evident perjury of applicants who know they will not be brought to account for the crime. This, of course, is corrupting public morals.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The efforts of this body to perfect its canons on marriage and divorce are watched with great interest by all Christians.

Its difficulties are in substance such as meet all who are seriously studying the question. Perhaps the most fundamental need of us all is to find that common ground on which the ecclesiastically trained mind, the learned jurist, the student of social science, and the man of practical affairs can stand together, and from which they can intelligently study what is a common problem.

This was one of the first necessities that confronted us in our early study of the subject, and recent discussions have strongly tended to deepen the conviction of this need. A clear discrimination of the relative places of natural, civil, and ecclesiastical law, with the different meanings of the term "law" in each field; of the ground on which the Great Teacher put the subject; of the use to be made of social science along with the grammar and lexicon in the interpretation of Scripture; and of the extent and ways in which these conclusions are

to be applied in teaching, in individual practice, and in ecclesiastical discipline, seem increasingly important to progress in the real solution of problems that have long vexed the churches.

THE FAMILY AND RELIGION AND MORAL EDUCATION.

There is a rapidly growing conviction that the religious and moral training of the young needs better methods. The Sunday school and other organizations do not, in the opinion of many, cover the ground, nor do the full work. At some points they overlap and interfere with each other, as is inevitable when different organizations attempt to care for the same class of persons without intelligent adjustment to each other and a common control. The revival of catechetical instruction has of late had many advocates; but others see the limitations of this method and the great need of adjusting it, when used at all, to modern conditions. Still others perceive that it is but a part of the greater problem of finding, measuring, and adjusting, to each other and to the common end, the different educational forces, including the Home, which has been the most neglected of all the educational institutions. The Home Department of the Sunday school, now coming into great favor among Sunday-school leaders, and rapidly growing in the number of its members, is teaching us a great lesson; for, though it touches the Home at a single point and for the one immediate object of Bible study, this new form of Sunday-school work must continually remind us of other resources of the Home that need discovery and use. The growing perception that Parental Associations are needed, in place of the present common restriction to associations of mothers alone, is another sign of the movement of thought towards the Home. Indeed, there is an increasing inquiry, in many directions, whether more attention must not be given to the Home. We report progress here on points more fully treated in recent Reports.

THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF THE FAMILY.

In various ways our attention has been called the past year to the need of greater care for the moralities of sex. Thoughtful persons are giving much attention to the subject, confessedly one extremely difficult of wise treatment. That there is less of the coarser forms of the vices of sex in many parts of the country than in earlier times is very likely true. That vice of this kind is less open in many places may also be true. Whether or not it on the whole is actually increasing may be an open question, too. And yet, with all this granted, the extent and influence of the evil are matters of grave concern. Its forms may be more insidious and its effects more serious. The recent utterances of the New England Watch and Ward Society, an organi-

zation that has the warmest commendation of the wisest people who know it, and the opinions of others who are specially devoted to this phase of the problem of the Family, together with the disclosures of those interested in municipal reform, should warn us not to neglect our duty regarding the subject.

But the point to be made here is that prevention must be largely the work of the Home, and in the creation of homelike conditions for the homeless. Direct attacks, especially if coming, as they are too apt to do, from persons of deficient judgment and sensibility, often do as much harm as good. But the patriotism of the Home, the nobility of the parental relation, the wise inculcation of truth regarding the sacredness of the human body in all its conditions, the incitement to higher things, the recognition of the wholesomeness of mental and physical exercise and even toil, and the creation of a healthful environment are possible and powerful preventions. Nothing can be more of a menace to society than any increasing insensibility of woman to the dignity of sex. If the temptations of wealth and social power in what are called the upper classes tend to this result the poison is sure to work downward.

THE AID OF PRACTICAL DEMOCRACY.

Two things especially are likely to insure the growth of the present interest in the Family. The first of these is the quickness of our people in the effort to get practical values when once discovered. When our people really become conscious of the distinct, positive value of the Home as an institution having rights of its own and a place and work of its own, of which neither school nor industrial pursuits nor social duties nor even the Church can rob it, they will not be slow to act. When they clearly see what the Home does and can do there will be little hesitation. In our democratic society the rise and growth of the public school and the Sunday school as two great popular institutions have been easy and rapid. So much has been done for them in their professional literature and their distinctive ways of operation that they have naturally filled the popular thought to the relative suppression of the Home. That they have helped the Home and carried it along in the general progress may be freely conceded; and yet the assertion is perfectly correct when we say that the Home has suffered from the movement; for the growth of the school idea has overshadowed and choked the growth of the Home so that the Home has not had its share of the light and air that give life to the school system. When the Home gets the attention and care that have been so generously bestowed on the Sunday school and the public school, or anything like it, we shall see a great change. It is

from the popular appreciation of practical values when they are really discovered that we may find great encouragement for the future of the Home.

THE CONTRAST TO BRITISH CONDITIONS.

The death of Queen Victoria brings to mind the great debt that every friend of the Home owes to that sovereign for the influence of her private and public life upon the Family. Perhaps no one of her many services to her own nation and to the world will ultimately be regarded as greater than that which she rendered to the Family as a social institution.

This calls to mind an important difference between British and American institutions that is too seldom considered. The idea of the Family enters into the very structure of the British Constitution. Its sovereign, one House of Parliament, much of local government, are directly dependent on the Family; and the right of primogeniture both protects and shapes certain interests of property and society. The colonial policy of England is the inevitable outgrowth of her domestic system. The responsibilities of the head of the Family and of the elder brother are reproduced in colonial methods as faithfully as the peculiarities of a cell find expression in the living body.

On the other hand, we are as democratic in regard to the Family as we are respecting the individual. We do not recognize the Family at all in our National Constitution. It appears in our State laws only as an object of some care, but not as an element of political power. Politically the Family is not in sight. We are purely individualistic, giving no recognized place to the paternal idea of Germany, nor to the altruism of the part of the elder brother, as in Great Britain. Hitherto ours has been purely a democratic fraternalism of absolute equality of individuals. Class distinctions based on the Family have no political recognition in the United States. It is true that wealth, descent, and purely social relations have their influence; yet the fact remains true that the democratic nature of our domestic system, with all its advantages, necessarily misses that powerful something which in England is felt from the throne to the cottage. The perils of democracy in the domestic institution are a part of the price we pay for our political system. Looking intently at the work of the individual, we have taken too little notice of the work of the Family in making the individual. It is possible that the contrasts we are fond of showing between our own domestic morality and that of other peoples may be less significant of our security than we think. The fear of Mr. Gladstone for our future centred very largely upon our ability to protect the Family.

THE SUPPORT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

But the popular discovery of the practical value of the Home to society and to the individual cannot fail to be hastened by the growth of interest in the study of Social Science. What twenty years ago was looked upon as chiefly mere prophecy when Elisha Mulford said that "Sociology is the coming science, and the Family is the key to its problems" is now fast becoming historical fact. We have already got on far enough to see that the study of the Home may soon be to the student of Social Science what the study of the cell has been of recent years to the biologist. It is quite conceivable that the future student for the ministry, the coming school-teacher, and the practical philanthropist will be required to know the Home and the Community life to something of the extent and with something of the thoroughness which the medical student reaches in his study of cell and tissue. The problems of the social order, like those of the physical body, are to be read in a knowledge of elements of the social structure. The growth of Social Science, then, inevitably insures corresponding attention to the Family.

THE BEARING ON SOCIAL REGENERATION.

That most difficult of all national problems, the preservation of an advanced, complex civilization from decay, the ability to repair the wastes civilization brings with it, the reconstruction of the social order after decay has once begun, and one which probably no people can yet fairly claim to have solved,— this problem of problems may soon confront us. Our hope of its solution must depend on the extent and breadth of our social vitality. If religion must furnish the spiritual power it must have social knowledge for its use. The growth of a true Social Science — the term is here used in its most comprehensive sense — supplies that knowledge. The future of the study of the Home in all our higher institutions of learning is well assured. The highly trained professional worker in any portion of the social field will soon have what to-day is only expert knowledge of the two great fundamental forms of social organization,— the Family and the next higher or communal association.

In the twenty years of our League's history, neither the negro problem in the South, nor the problem of the tenement-house in our cities, nor that of country districts, nor the sapping of home life by the demands and corruptions of wealth, have grown any less serious. Needless divorces, reckless marriages, sexual vices, have perhaps decreased in localities; but the volume of evil is already too great for overmuch congratulation. And we are taking into our common life, or at least

into close relations with it, other peoples, one of whose fundamental needs is that of a better Home.

On the other hand, public opinion is in better condition than it was when our work began. For the last fifteen years few attempts to debase farther our marriage or divorce legislation have been ventured. If begun, defeat has been the certain fate of the attempt. Good authority has said that this is one of the two or three classes of all our State legislation in which the improvement is most marked. The Church is more awake than ever to the perils and needs of the Home, though as yet doing hardly more than feel her way. The greatest gain is in the University and College. From a condition of universal neglect, the Family has come to have a pretty general recognition in these institutions and in most theological seminaries. The literature of the Family, though still scanty, has increased more in the last twenty years than in at least a hundred before that time. The various social sciences, like politics, economics, social ethics, pedagogy, the study of the defective, delinquent, and dependent classes, are all coming to attach more importance to the Family. Even the traditional opponent of the saloon is beginning to find that he must study the Home as well as the saloon.

Practical philanthropy and Social Science, therefore, make sure the future of popular interest in the Family. Our institutions of technology and our biological laboratories are improving our industries and bodily health. So the growing work in Social Science will tell on the conditions of our domestic life and corporate character.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ADDRESSES.

We reported last year a great increase in inquiries for information. There have been still more the past year. Over one hundred came in two weeks as the result of a single notice of our Report, — a notice written entirely without our knowledge. These and others like them come from all parts of this country and some came from other countries. Editors, lawyers, teachers, students, legislators, and clergymen are constantly sending for information or suggestions. In turn we get knowledge of local conditions and movements for reform, and are able to initiate new measures.

The call for addresses is again increasing. The topics of the Family on which these are desired are more varied and more specific, showing a better apprehension of the intricacies of the subject. The time for monographic work on the Home seems near at hand. Ministers, teachers, and Women's Clubs, for example, do not now so often as formerly ask what they can do to secure better legislation for the State, but, What can be done by us in our own peculiar field of work?

Part of this is due to our effort to guide public opinion in this direction, and part of it to a better sense of social proportion and what it requires.

If the Secretary could give his time almost wholly to his more proper work, there would be a much greater gain. On the other hand, if he could give more personal attention to collections, the means for the work would be more abundant, as the receipts for December show for a single month of such work. General Armstrong or Booker Washington could leave a corps of assistants at home while they went out to collect money. This cannot be done in a small society without great damage to the work. We have some contributors who send money without being asked. Others give promptly when asked. We need more of these classes. We need churches and individuals who voluntarily put us on their regular or occasional lists.

OUR INCOME AND EXPENDITURES.

These are more nearly equal than in recent years. The regular receipts for the year increased and the expenses were reduced. Most of those who regularly give twenty-five dollars and upwards each year, and as many more annual donors of smaller sums, have this year sent a like amount towards the payment of the debt. During the year $1,058 were given in this way, thus paying off over two-thirds of the indebtedness. A little for the same purpose has come since. Various delays prevented the appeal to the public which the committee intended to make before the year ended. The Committee on Finance report in the minutes, on page 3.

The League, in common with many other philanthropic interests, has lost a valued friend and counselor in the death of the Hon. Charles Chauncey Burr, of its Executive Committee. Mr. Burr was a man of singular kindness, tact, and practical wisdom, and was greatly devoted to the public welfare in many ways.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer.*

In account with the National League for the Protection of the Family.

DR.		CR.	
Dec. 31, 1900.		Dec. 31, 1900.	
To Receipts from Contributions for General Expenses for the work of the League as per details in Cash Book	$2,110 61	By Disbursements for the year 1900, as per Cash Book:	
		General Expenses, —	
		Travelling . . .	$213 58
		Postage	43 40
		Advertising, Express, etc. . .	5 40
		Printing	96 55
		Stationery . . .	8 06
To Special Donations for reduction of Debt as per details in Cash Book	$1,058 00	Paid on account of Salary of Secretary ($1,800 per annum) . .	1,743 62
			$2,110 61
		MEMORANDA.	
		General Expenses for 1900	$366 99
		Salary of Secretary	1,800 00
			$2,166 99
		Receipts for General Expenses	$2,110 61
		Deficiency in the year 1900	$56 38
		Deficiency Dec. 31, 1899, $1,496 45; Less Special Contributions for Debt, $1,058 00 . .	$438 45
		Total Deficiency Dec. 31, 1900	$494 83

January 28, 1901. I have this day examined the above account covering the year 1900, with the vouchers therefor, and I find the same correct.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, *Auditor.*

CONTRIBUTIONS.*

Jan. 2.	Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn.	$3 00	
3.	Walter L. Frisbie, Waterbury, Conn.	3 00	
4.	President Seth Low, LL.D., New York	50 00	
8.	First Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn.	25 39	
15.	Hon. Chas. C. Burr, Auburndale	40 00	
17.	Mrs. Theodore D. Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	50 00	
17.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	35 00	
20.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	5 00	
24.	State Street Church, Portland, Me.	25 00	
26.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
29.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00	
31.	Rev. F. B. Makepeace, Springfield	1 00	
	Received in January		$267 39
Feb. 8.	Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Center	$5 00	
9.	Mrs. George H. Ide, Milwaukee, Wis.	1 00	
10.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
13.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00	
14.	Hon. William E. Dodge, New York	100 00	
14.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	
15.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
16.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
16.	Henry G. Marquand, New York	5 00	
17.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
17.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00	
20.	Robert H. Gardiner, Chestnut Hill	5 00	
21.	Wm. G. Benedict, Boston	15 00	
21.	Edgar G. Miller, Baltimore, Md.	5 00	
21.	Rev. C. W. Huntington, Lowell	5 00	
21.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Auburndale	10 00	
22.	George Burnham, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
23.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
24.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
26.	Christ Church, Bay Ridge, L. I.	2 00	
27.	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.	5 00	
28.	Prof. Ad. Tanquery, S.S., Baltimore, Md.	2 00	
	Received in February		$287 00
Mar. 1.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	$5 00	
2.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
3.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
5.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
5.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
5.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00	
6.	Rt. Rev. William C. Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00	
Mar. 6.	Woman's Missionary Society, St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00	

* For special donations for the debt, see page 22.

Mar. 10.	The Very Rev. Eugene A. Hoffman, D.D., LL.D., New York	25 00	
12.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
12.	South Congregational Church, Springfield	25 00	
13.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00	
16.	Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Washington	15 00	
20.	Rev. Frederick W. Green, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
22.	Morris K. Jesup, New York	10 00	
22.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	30 00	
27.	Rev. William S. Hubbell, D.D., New York	5 00	
28.	All Saints Church, Worcester	10 00	
31.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago	2 00	
	Received in March		$202 00
April 2.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	$2 00	
5.	Prof. Henry W. Farnham, New Haven, Conn.	25 00	
10.	Dr. Lucien Howe, Buffalo, N. Y.	5 00	
11.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	10 00	
11.	Rev. W. H. Davis, D.D., Newton	5 00	
12.	Rev. Herbert W. Lathe, Pasadena, Cal.	6 00	
12.	St. Ann's Church, Lowell	25 00	
14.	Prof. A. R. Merriam, Hartford, Conn.	2 00	
17.	George B. Knapp, Boston	10 00	
21.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Cambridge	50 00	
23.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	3 00	
26.	W. P. Henzy, Philadelphia, Penn.	20 00	
26.	Rev. H. C. Trumbull, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	5 00	
	Received in April		$168 00
May 5.	C. W. Wilder, Newton	$10 00	
14.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, LL.D., Boston	10 00	
14.	James Schouler, Boston	5 00	
15.	Rev. William Prall, D.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00	
21.	Prof. Walter F. Willcox, Ph.D., Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
28.	Rev. A. M. Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00	
30.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
31.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Penn.	10 00	
	Received in May		$58 00
June 4.	Rev. Cecil F. P. Bancroft, LL.D., Andover	$5 00	
4.	Wingate P. Sargent, Melrose	5 00	
7.	D. C. Heath, Newtonville	5 00	
9.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
9.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.	20 00	
14.	Prof. Lewis O. Barstow, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
19.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn.	5 00	
21.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
23.	Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn.	5 00	
23.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	20 00	
23.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00	
28.	Mrs. C. P. Turner, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
30.	South Evangelical Church, West Roxbury	5 00	
	Received in June		$145 00

July 11.	St. John's Church, Stamford, Conn.	$26 17	
21.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	2 00	
23.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	Received in July		$33 17
Aug. 29.	"L. H. W.," Boston	$10 00	
	Received in August		$10 00
Oct. 3.	Rev. Stephen W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	$5 00	
10.	"A Friend," Auburndale	5 00	
17.	W. H. Eaton, Lee	5 00	
20.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
26.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	Received in October		$45 00
Nov. 7.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00	
11.	J. Howard Nichols, Newton	5 00	
11.	Rev. F. E. Emrich, D.D., South Framingham	10 00	
22.	Miss Susan Bronson, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
23.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
23.	Prof. W. W. Atwater, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
23.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
28.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
29.	Prof. William North Rice, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
30.	"J. H. W.," New York	20 00	
	Received in November		$115 00
Dec. 3.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	$50 00	
3.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	10 00	
3.	Prof. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
4.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
6.	Edward B. Bassett, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
7.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00	
10.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00	
10.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00	
13.	Hon. R. D. Benedict, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00	
13.	Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls, New York	10 00	
13.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00	
13.	"A Friend," New York	5 00	
14.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	
15.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
17.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	100 00	
18.	W. W. Lockwood, New York	5 00	
18.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
22.	Mrs. A. S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn.	25 00	
22.	Mrs. Charlotte P. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
22.	Rev. J. G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
22.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	10 00	
22.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00	
24.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
26.	Prof. M. D. Crawford, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
26.	Rev. Herbert Welch, Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
26.	President George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst	15 00	
27.	Mrs. Samuel Colt, Hartford, Conn.	50 00	

Dec. 27.	Dr. G. Pierepont Davis, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
27.	Trinity Church, Hartford, Conn.	5 00
27.	Rev. Chas. E. Jefferson, New York	5 00
28.	Rev. James Bixler, New London, Conn.	5 00
29.	Mrs. Daniel Merriman, Cambridge	10 00
29.	Rev. Llewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn.	10 00
29.	Gen. W. A. Aiken, Norwich, Conn.	5 00
29.	A. C. Tenney, Chelsea	2 00
29.	Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn.	5 00
29.	Rev. S. L. Blake, D.D., New London, Conn.	5 00
31.	Rev. F. E. Clark, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
31.	William P. Ellison, Newton	10 00
31.	"A Member, Eliot Church," Newton	5 00
31.	President G. Stanley Hall, LL.D., Worcester	5 00
31.	Hon. L. D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn.	5 00
31.	Francis B. Sears, Boston	5 00
31.	First Church, Nashua, N. H.	12 00
31.	Rev. F. B. Allen, Boston	5 00
31.	Francis Lynde Stetson, New York	30 00
31.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	10 00
31.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., New York	25 00
31.	Trinity Church, Boston	25 00
31.	First Church, Meriden, Conn.	25 00
31.	Central Church, Worcester	8 05
31.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00
	Received in December	$780 05

SPECIAL RECEIPTS FOR DEBT.

Mar. 6.	Hon. William E. Dodge, New York	$100 00
9.	President Seth Low, LL.D., New York	100 00
10.	The Very Rev. Eugene A. Hoffman, D.D., LL.D., New York	50 00
12.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00
13.	Robert C. Ogden, New York	25 00
16.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00
16.	Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Washington, D.C.	10 00
April 2.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00
2.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00
2.	John Nicholas Brown, Providence, R. I.	25 00
2.	Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
4.	President George Harris, LL.D., Amherst	15 00
10.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00
11.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	5 00
12.	St. Anne's Church, Lowell	15 00
14.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Conn.	20 00
19.	Rev. John Brown, D.D., New York	5 00
21.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Cambridge	50 00
23.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	2 00
26.	W. P. Henzy, Philadelphia, Penn.	20 00

May 5.	C. W. Wilder, Newton	10 00
12.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Penn.	35 00
29.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
29.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00
29.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00
31.	Morris K. Jesup, New York	10 00
June 11.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00
19.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Conn.	5 00
21.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00
22.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	10 00
23.	Miss Mary I. Lockwood, New London, Conn.	5 00
23.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	20 00
23.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00
23.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	10 00
23.	Edwin Ginn, Winchester	10 00
23.	Mrs. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	6 00
25.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
July 5.	Charles Dudley Warner, Hartford, Conn.	10 00
5.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00
5.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00
18.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00
18.	Hon. Charles C. Burr, Auburndale	10 00
Aug. 8.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	10 00
Nov. 18.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	25 00
Dec. 3.	Prof. J. Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00
17.	Rev. Lewis F. Benson, Philadelphia, Penn.	10 00
29.	The Corresponding Secretary	100 00
	Total	$1,058 00

OUR AIMS, METHODS, AND RESULTS.

THE AIM of the League is twofold: to protect the Family and to make it more efficient for good. Without dogmas or pet measures of its own, it seeks to be an adequate and efficient agency for all who desire the stability and improvement of the Family as a social institution.

A COMPREHENSIVE VIEW is taken of its special problems. The Family is such a whole, and so related to other social institutions, that Marriage, Divorce, Polygamy, Chastity, etc., are parts of one subject, and that one that is vital to every interest of religion, education, industry, and patriotism. The relative neglect of the Family in the past is

an additional and urgent reason for special interest in it now. The progress of Social Science will inevitably turn attention to the Family.

ITS METHODS follow these lines: the collection of facts, by disinterested official statisticians when practicable, the introduction of the study of the Family in educational institutions and elsewhere, the publication of articles in reviews and other periodicals, public addresses, personal conferences, and correspondence.

RESULTS are already important. The League secured the Government Report on Marriage and Divorce. It has stimulated and directed public opinion. It has shared with other agencies in bringing about marked improvement in the Marriage and Divorce Laws of many States. This affects the system of marriage license and registration, procedure in divorce cases, restrictions on migratory divorces, the removal of "omnibus clauses," and the careful and effective treatment of the problem of uniform legislation, now in the hands of commissions from three-fourths of the States.

Educational conditions are greatly changed. The study of the Family is now frequent in educational institutions and elsewhere. The Home is coming to be a distinctly recognized factor in the problems of church, school, and philanthropic efforts. The Home Department of the Sunday school is fast gaining favor and is pointing the way to other things for the Home. And there is such a general interest in Social Science as soon to compel study of the Family and its uses, much as biology has forced attention to the cell.

ITS FRIENDS. These may be found in the names of our officers and contributors, the scores of our best colleges, universities, theological seminaries, and other schools that have invited our lectures and sought our publications, the opening of our best periodicals to our papers, the aid our own and foreign offices give to our investigations, the service of our Secretary in investigations and associations of scientific men, the interest of eminent men in England and elsewhere in our work, and, best of all, perhaps, the grateful words and eager inquiries that come from students, teachers, pastors, and home and foreign missionaries. These show who are the friends of the League.

For a fuller sketch of the movement and work, see "The Review of Fifteen Years" and the annual reports generally.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in fraternal and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number. . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, 614 Atlantic Ave., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of..... .....dollars, the principal [or income as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.